



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,422	05/24/2001	William D. Norcott	50277-1006	9402

23517 7590 12/20/2005

SWIDLER BERLIN LLP
3000 K STREET, NW
BOX 1P
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

ALI, MOHAMMAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2166

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/863,422	Applicant(s) NORCOTT, WILLIAM D.	
	Examiner Mohammad Ali	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but before the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/05/05 has been entered.

Claims 1-17 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorie et al. ('Lorie' hereinafter), US Patent 5,280,612 in view of Robert David Goldring ('Goldring' hereinafter), US Patent 5,553,279.

With respect to claim 1,

Lorie teaches a method for synchronous change data capture (see col. 15, lines 47-45), comprising the steps of:

generating a transaction identifier for each transaction in a plurality of transactions (all transactions whose updates are not yet visible to queries. Of course, for the N version embodiment of this invention, there will be a NSUL bit vector for each of a plurality of successively older stable database versions, each such NSUL vector containing all transactions whose updates are not visible to queries of the same or earlier version as the NSUL vector, see col. 10, lines 7-14, Lorie) that uniquely identifies each transaction (a record data pointer, PTR, which points to the location in storage containing the record data for this record version and a transaction identifier TRN, which indicates the sequential identifier for the transaction that created this record version, see col. 8, lines 59-63);

for each operation in a transaction (see col. 13, lines 9-11, Lorie), recording change data for the operation and the transaction identifier for the transaction in the plurality of transactions (all transactions whose updates are not yet visible to queries. Of course, for the N version embodiment of this invention, there will be a NSUL bit vector for each of a plurality of successively older stable database versions, each such NSUL vector containing all transactions whose updates are not visible to queries of the same or earlier version as the NSUL vector, see col. 10, lines 7-14, Lorie) in a first database object wherein at least one of the transactions include a plurality of operations (the system maintain a record key structure for each record in the database. The database has series of records, each of which is identified by such a key, which

can be a logical key or any other suitable type of record identifier, see col. 8, lines 37-46, Fig. 2, Lorie); and

during a commit of the transaction (see col. 11, lines 11-16, Lorie), recording the transaction identifier and a system change number in a second database object,.... (a first version, PTR(1), representing the uncommitted state of record, a second version, PTR(2), representing the last committed value that is not in the stable state, and third version, PTR(3), representing the stable state for type Q queries. These three versions are organized in a record key structure, see col. 8, lines 50-58 et seq, Lorie).

Lorie does not explicitly indicate the claimed "commit that is later than a previously committed".

Goldring discloses the claimed commit that is later than a previously committed (a computer processing system that receives sequences of updates to source data tables in a data base and records them into an activity log for later retrieval, generates a consistent change data table from the retrieved activity log such that the consistent change data table contains sufficient change information to refresh copies of the source data through multiple generations of target copies by consulting the consistent change data table and applying the table entries to the last prior refreshed source table. The consistent change data table contains committed change operations retrieved from the activity log in the order in which they were committed, beginning with a time no earlier than the last prior refresh (see col. 2, lines 66 to col. 3, lines 11, Goldring).

It would have obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references, because

commit that is later than a previously committed of Goldring's teaching would have allowed Lorie's system the to produce multi-generational copies of data base tables for replication from one copy level to any other subsequent level, or iteration of copy without losing any change information, as suggested by Goldring, at col. 3, lines 12-14. Commit that is later than a previously committed as taught by Goldring improves consistent change data tables that contains commit time information for placing transactions in the order which they are committed in the operation (see col. 3, lines 29-34, Goldring).

As to claim 2,

Lorie teaches further comprising the step of: recording an identifier to identify a relative ordering of each operation in the transaction (each new transaction is initiated a TRN serial number is assigned in sequence, for TRN numbers M and following. The UL and NSUL are organized as bit map vectors indexed according to the TRN serial number such that a bit in each list is set to one to include the corresponding TRN serial number on the list, see col. 9, lines 62-67 and col. 8, lines 37-42, Fig. 3).

As to claim 3,

Lorie teaches further comprising, during the commit of the transaction (see col. 8, lines 50-58), the steps of:

obtaining a concurrency lock (query must access the most recent database version, it is relabeled and restarted as an updating transaction and thereby acquire the necessary read locks on all data, see co. 5, lines 4-7 and col. 6, lines 13-15);

after obtaining the concurrency lock, generating the system change number (see col. 5, lines 8-14, Lorie) and performing said recording the transaction identifier and the system change number in the second database object (version control and tracking is implemented by maintaining several version transaction identification lists. In main memory, the system maintains a list of uncommitted update transaction and list of committed but not yet stable state update transactions. The record key version provides a each record version and identifies the creating transaction for each record version, see col. 5, lines 34-44 and col. 13, lines 10-17 et seq, Lorie), and concluding the commit (a new version of a record is created whenever any updating transaction writes new data to a record that was created by a previous committed transaction, see col. 5, lines 23-25, Lorie); and

after said recording the transaction identifier and the system change number in the second database object (see col. 5, lines 34-44 and col. 13, lines 10-17 et seq, Lorie), releasing the concurrency lock (force to write the commit record log, remove the transaction number form UL and release all locks, see col. 14, lines 51-53 and col. 11, lines 11-15, Lorie).

As to claim 4,

Lorie teaches wherein the first database object comprises a change table and the second database object comprises a transaction table (when transaction activity is low, if a page is modified, then all records on the page can be scanned for supercilious versions, taking into account the UL and NSUL tables "first and second table" as for an update operation. When the transaction activity is very low, a garbage collection

transaction can clean up a few pages at a time. This would bring down the average number of record versions in the database and would be particularly appropriate for a dedicated back-end database machine, see col. 13, lines 9-17).

As to claim 5,

Lorie teaches further comprising the step of: associating the change data in the first database object with the system change number in the second database object based on the transaction identifier (version block record key structure is associated with record data. Version control and tracking is implemented by maintaining several version transaction identification lists. In main memory, the system maintains a list of uncommitted update transaction and list of committed but not yet stable state update transactions. The record key version provides a each record version and identifies the creating transaction for each record version, see col. 5, lines 32-52 and col. 13, lines 10-17 et seq, Lorie).

As to claim 6,

Lorie teaches a computer-readable medium (see col. 5, lines 36-38, Lorie) bearing instructions for synchronous change data capture (see col. 15, lines 47-51, Lorie), said instructions arranged, upon execution (two version rules for actions taken at various stage of the execution of a transaction and a query, see col. 10, lines 18-21 Lorie), to cause one or more processors to perform the steps of the method (when transaction activity is low, if a page is modified, then all records on the page can be scanned for supercilious versions, taking into account the UL and NSUL tables as for an update operation. When the transaction activity is very low, a garbage collection

transaction can clean up a few pages at a time. This would bring down the average number of record versions in the database and would be particularly appropriate for a dedicated back-end database machine, see col. 13, lines 9-17, Lorie).

With respect to claim 7,

Lorie teaches a method for processing synchronously captured change data (see col. 15, lines 47-51, Lorie), comprising:

accessing a first database object (access the most recent database version, it relabeled and restarted as an updating transaction and thereby acquire the necessary read locks on all data, see col. 5, lines 3-7, Lorie) comprising change data for each operation in a plurality of operations performed within each transaction in a plurality of transactions (all transactions whose updates are not yet visible to queries. Of course, for the N version embodiment of this invention, there will be a NSUL bit vector for each of a plurality of successively older stable database versions, each such NSUL vector containing all transactions whose updates are not visible to queries of the same or earlier version as the NSUL vector, see col. 10, lines 7-14, Lorie) and a transaction identifier that uniquely identifies each transaction in the plurality of transactions and the plurality of operations performed within each transaction (a record data pointer, PTR, which points to the location in storage containing the record data for this record version and a transaction identifier TRN, which indicates the sequential identifier for the transaction that created this record version, see col. 8, lines 59-63, Lorie);

accessing a second database object comprising a first transaction identifier and a system change number (version control and tracking is implemented by maintaining

several version transaction identification lists. In main memory, the system maintains a list of uncommitted update transaction and list of committed but not yet stable state update transactions. The record key version provides a each record version and identifies the creating transaction for each record version, see col. 5, lines 34-44 and col. 13, lines 10-17 et seq, Lorie); and

associating the change data in the first database object with the first system change number in the second database object based on the first transaction identifier,.... (version block record key structure is associated with record data. Version control and tracking is implemented by maintaining several version transaction identification lists. In main memory, the system maintains a list of uncommitted update transaction and list of committed but not yet stable state update transactions. The record key version provides a each record version and identifies the creating transaction for each record version, see col. 5, lines 32-52 and col. 13, lines 10-17 et seq, Lorie).

Lorie does not explicitly indicate the claimed "commit that is later than a previously committed".

Goldring discloses the claimed commit that is later than a previously committed (a computer processing system that receives sequences of updates to source data tables in a data base and records them into an activity log for later retrieval, generates a consistent change data table from the retrieved activity log such that the consistent change data table contains sufficient change information to refresh copies of the source data through multiple generations of target copies by consulting the consistent change data table and applying the table entries to the last prior refreshed source table. The

consistent change data table contains committed change operations retrieved from the activity log in the order in which they were committed, beginning with a time no earlier than the last prior refresh (see col. 2, lines 66 to col. 3, lines 11, Goldring).

It would have obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references, because commit that is later than a previously committed of Goldring's teaching would have allowed Lorie's system the to produce multi-generational copies of data base tables for replication from one copy level to any other subsequent level, or iteration of copy without losing any change information, as suggested by Goldring, at col. 3, lines 12-14. Commit that is later than a previously committed as taught by Goldring improves consistent change data tables that contains commit time information for placing transactions in the order which they are committed in the operation (see col. 3, lines 29-34, Goldring).

As to claim 9,

Lorie teaches a computer-readable medium (see col. 5, lines 36-38, Lorie) bearing instructions for synchronous change data capture (see col. 15, lines 47-51, Lorie), said instructions arranged, upon execution (two version rules for actions taken at various stage of the execution of a transaction and a query, see col. 10, lines 18-21 Lorie), to cause one or more processors to perform the steps of the method (when transaction activity is low, if a page is modified, then all records on the page can be scanned for supercilious versions, taking into account the UL and NSUL tables "first and second table" as for an update operation. When the transaction activity is very low, a

garbage collection transaction can clean up a few pages at a time. This would bring down the average number of record versions in the database and would be particularly appropriate for a dedicated back-end database machine, see col. 13, lines 9-17, Lorie).

With respect to claim 10,

Lorie teaches a method for synchronous change data capture (see col. 15, lines 47-51, Lorie), comprising the steps of:

generating a transaction identifier that uniquely identifies a transaction (a record data pointer, PTR, which points to the location in storage containing the record data for this record version and a transaction identifier TRN, which indicates the sequential identifier for the transaction that created this record version, see col. 8, lines 59-63); for each operation in a transaction (see col. 13, lines 9-11, Lorie), recording change data for the operation and the transaction identifier or each transaction in a plurality of transactions (all transactions whose updates are not yet visible to queries. Of course, for the N version embodiment of this invention, there will be a NSUL bit vector for each of a plurality of successively older stable database versions, each such NSUL vector containing all transactions whose updates are not visible to queries of the same or earlier version as the NSUL vector, see col. 10, lines 7-14, Lorie) in a change table wherein at least one of the transactions include a plurality of operations (the system maintain a record key structure for each record in the database. The database has series of records, each of which is identified by such a key, which can be a logical key or any other suitable type of record identifier, see col. 8, lines 37-46, Fig. 2); and

during a commit of the transaction (see col. 8, lines 50-58), performing the steps of:

obtaining a concurrency lock (query must access the most recent database version, it is relabeled and restarted as an updating transaction and thereby acquire the necessary read locks on all data, see co. 5, lines 4-7 and col. 6, lines 13-15);

after obtaining the concurrency lock, generating a system change number,... (see col. 5, lines 8-14, Lorie) and recording the transaction identifier and the system change number in the database table (version control and tracking is implemented by maintaining several version transaction identification lists. In main memory, the system maintains a list of uncommitted update transaction and list of committed but not yet stable state update transactions. The record key version provides a each record version and identifies the creating transaction for each record version, see col. 5, lines 34-44 and col. 13, lines 10-17 et seq, Lorie); and

after said recording the transaction identifier and the system change number in the database table (see col. 5, lines 34-44 and col. 13, lines 10-17 et seq, Lorie), releasing the concurrency lock (force to write the commit record log, remove the transaction number form UL and release all locks, see col. 14, lines 51-53 and col. 11, lines 11-15, Lorie).

Lorie does not explicitly indicate the claimed "commit that is later than a previously committed".

Goldring discloses the claimed commit that is later than a previously committed (a computer processing system that receives sequences of updates to source data

Art Unit: 2166

tables in a data base and records them into an activity log for later retrieval, generates a consistent change data table from the retrieved activity log such that the consistent change data table contains sufficient change information to refresh copies of the source data through multiple generations of target copies by consulting the consistent change data table and applying the table entries to the last prior refreshed source table. The consistent change data table contains committed change operations retrieved from the activity log in the order in which they were committed, beginning with a time no earlier than the last prior refresh (see col. 2, lines 66 to col. 3, lines 11, Goldring).

It would have obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references, because commit that is later than a previously committed of Goldring's teaching would have allowed Lorie's system the to produce multi-generational copies of data base tables for replication from one copy level to any other subsequent level, or iteration of copy without losing any change information, as suggested by Goldring, at col. 3, lines 12-14. Commit that is later than a previously committed as taught by Goldring improves consistent change data tables that contains commit time information for placing transactions in the order which they are committed in the operation (see col. 3, lines 29-34, Goldring).

As to claim 11,

Lorie teaches a computer-readable medium (see col. 5, lines 36-38, Lorie) bearing instructions for synchronous change data capture, said instructions arranged, upon execution (two version rules for actions taken at various stage of the execution of

a transaction and a query, see col. 10, lines 18-21 Lorie), to cause one or more processors to perform the steps of the method (when transaction activity is low, if a page is modified, then all records on the page can be scanned for supercilious versions, taking into account the UL and NSUL tables "first and second table" as for an update operation. When the transaction activity is very low, a garbage collection transaction can clean up a few pages at a time. This would bring down the average number of record versions in the database and would be particularly appropriate for a dedicated back-end database machine, see col. 13, lines 9-17, Lorie).

As to claim 8,

Lorie teaches wherein the step of associating includes performing a database operation on the first database object and the second database object (when transaction activity is low, if a page is modified, then all records on the page can be scanned for supercilious versions, taking into account the UL and NSUL tables "first and second table" as for an update operation. When the transaction activity is very low, a garbage collection transaction can clean up a few pages at a time. This would bring down the average number of record versions in the database and would be particularly appropriate for a dedicated back-end database machine, see col. 13, lines 9-17 and col. 5, lines 48-52).

Lorie does not explicitly indicate the claimed "join operation".

Goldring discloses the claimed join operation (the Consistent_Change_Data table includes only updates that have been committed and is created by performing an

Art Unit: 2166

SQL join operation on the Change_Data and VOW tables, see col. 7, lines 1-3, Fig. 6, Goldring).

It would have obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references, because join operation of Goldring's teaching would have allowed Lorie's system the to produce multi-generational copies of data base tables for replication from one copy level to any other subsequent level, or iteration of copy without losing any change information, as suggested by Goldring, at col. 3, lines 12-14. Join operation as taught by Goldring improves consistent change data tables that contains commit time information for placing transactions in the order which they are committed in the operation (see col. 3, lines 29-34, Goldring).

As to claim 12,

Lorie teaches, wherein the system change number indicates an event occurring between said obtaining the concurrency lock and said releasing the concurrency lock (see col. 5, lines 8-14, Lorie).

As to claim 13,

Lorie teaches wherein the system change number indicates an event occurring before the commit of the transaction (query must access the most recent database version, it is relabeled and restarted as an updating transaction and thereby acquire the necessary read locks on all data, see co. 5, lines 4-7 and col. 6, lines 13-15 et seq.).

As to claim 14,

Lorie teaches generating a commit system change number for the transaction (see col. 5, lines 34-44 and col. 13, lines 10-17 et seq, Lorie) that is later then the system change number (force to write the commit record log, remove the transaction number form UL and release all locks, see col. 14, lines 51-53 and col. 11, lines 11-15, Lorie).

As to claim 15,

Lorie teaches wherein the system change number indicates an event occurring between said obtaining the concurrency lock and said releasing the concurrency lock (see col. 5, lines 8-14 et seq., Lorie).

As to claim 16,

Lorie teaches wherein the system change number indicates an event occurring before the commit of the transaction (version control and tracking is implemented by maintaining several version transaction identification lists. In main memory, the system maintains a list of uncommitted update transaction and list of committed but not yet stable state update transactions. The record key version provides a each record version and identifies the creating transaction for each record version, see col. 5, lines 8-14, 34-44 and col. 13, lines 10-17 et seq, Lorie).

As to claim 17,

Lorie teaches generating a commit system change number for the transaction that is later then the system change number (version control and tracking is implemented by maintaining several version transaction identification lists. In main memory, the system maintains a list of uncommitted update transaction and list of

committed but not yet stable state update transactions. The record key version provides a each record version and identifies the creating transaction for each record version, see col. 5, lines 34-44 and col. 13, lines 10-17 et seq, Lorie).

Remarks

4. Applicant's argue that Lorie "during a commit of the transaction, recording the transaction identifier and a system change number in a second database object, wherein the system change number indicates a timing of the commit that is later than a previously committed transaction".

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Further, Examiner respectfully submits that Lorie and Goldring discloses the particular limitation as stated in the detail Office Action.

In response to the applicant's arguments "wherein the system change number is recorded during a commit of the transaction and indicates a timing of the commit that is later than a previously committed transaction".

The Examiner respectfully submits that Lorie and Goldring discloses the particular limitation as stated in the detail Office Action.

Applicant's argue that Goldring does not cure deficiencies Lorie.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

Art Unit: 2166

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references, because commit that is later than a previously committed of Goldring's teaching would have allowed Lorie's system the to produce multi-generational copies of data base tables for replication from one copy level to any other subsequent level, or iteration of copy without losing any change information, as suggested by Goldring, at col. 3, lines 12-14. Commit that is later than a previously committed as taught by Goldring improves consistent change data tables that contains commit time information for placing transactions in the order which they are committed in the operation (see col. 3, lines 29-34, Goldring). Further, it would have obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references, because join operation of Goldring's teaching would have allowed Lorie's system the to produce multi-generational copies of data base tables for replication from one copy level to any other subsequent level, or iteration of copy without losing any change information, as suggested by Goldring, at col. 3, lines 12-14. Join operation as taught by Goldring improves consistent change data tables that contains commit time information for

Art Unit: 2166

placing transactions in the order which they are committed in the operation (see col. 3, lines 29-34, Goldring).

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification.

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Reference is made to MPEP 2144.01 - Implicit Disclosure

"[I]n considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." In re Preda, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968)

Subsequent to an analysis of the claims it was revealed that a number of limitations recited in the claims belong in the prior art and thus encompassed and/or implicitly disclosed in the reference (s) applied and cited. It is logical for the examiner to focus on the limitations that are "crux of the invention" and not involve a lot of energy and time for the things that are not central to the invention, but peripheral. The examiner is aware of the duties to address each and every element of claims, however, it is also important that a person prosecuting a patent application before the Office or an stakeholders of patent granting process make effort to understand the level of one of ordinary skill in the (data processing) art or the level one of skilled in the (data processing) art, as encompassed by the applied and cited references. The

administrative convenience derived from such a cooperation between the attorneys and examiners benefits the Office as well the patentee.

In view of the above, the examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Action.

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

In response to applicant's argument, to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

"Test of obviousness is not whether features of secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into primary reference's structure, nor whether claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of references; rather, test is what combined teachings of references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in art."

In re Keller, Terry, and Davies, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

"Reason, suggestion, or motivation to combine two or more prior art references in single invention may come from references themselves, from knowledge of those skilled in art that certain references or disclosures in references are known to be of interest in particular field, or from nature of problem to be solved;" *Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics Inc.* U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 37 USPQ2d 1626 Decided February 7, 1996 Nos. 95-1171, - 1181

Art Unit: 2166

"[q]uestion is whether there is something in prior art as whole to suggest desirability, and thus obviousness, of making combination." Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company et al. U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 221 USPQ 481 Decided Mar. 21, 1984 No 83-1178.

Hence, Applicants' arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of records.


In light of the foregoing arguments, the 103 rejections are hereby sustained.

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-4105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 am-6:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Mohammad Ali
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2166

MA
December 16, 2005